

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

14669

tive and more recent data will show an increase in the number of aged with insurance as well as a greater percentage of the younger persons with both hospital and surgical insurance.

A quick glance at the coverage for some of the younger groups will reveal the fact that nearly 75 percent of some of the groups have hospital insurance, and nearly 70 percent of these same groups have surgical insurance. Surely these people do not need or want medi-

care—they already have a far better program than is offered by medicare.

The most significant single factor prompting my charge that the problem is transitional is the tremendous increase in the number of persons covered with hospital insurance in the past two decades.

The strongest supporters of medicare argue that private insurance has not met and cannot now meet the needs of our people. In rebuttal, I offer the following table:

Number of people protected for hospital, surgical, regular, and major medical expense, loss of income, and percent of persons with hospital insurance who also have surgical insurance and regular medical insurance: United States, selected years, 1940-60¹

Year	Type of protection (in thousands)					Percent of persons with hospital insurance who also have—	
	Hospital expense	Surgical expense	Regular medical expense	Major medical expense	Loss of income	Surgical insurance	Regular medical insurance
1940	12,312	5,350	3,000	-----	(2)	43.5	24.4
1945	32,068	12,890	4,713	-----	(2)	40.2	14.7
1950	76,639	54,156	21,589	-----	37,793	70.7	28.2
1955	107,662	91,927	55,506	5,241	39,513	85.4	51.6
1956	115,949	101,325	64,891	8,876	41,688	87.4	56.0
1957	121,432	108,931	71,813	13,262	42,939	89.7	59.1
1958	123,038	111,435	75,395	17,375	41,870	90.6	61.3
1959	127,896	116,944	82,615	21,850	42,169	91.4	64.6
1960	131,962	121,045	87,541	27,448	42,436	91.7	66.3

¹ Adjusted for duplication.

² Not available.

Source: Medical Care Financing and Utilization, Source Book of Data through 1961, prepared by the Health Economics Branch of the Division of Community Health Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, published in 1962.

In 1940, there were over 12 million persons covered with hospital insurance. In 10 years, the number had jumped to nearly 77 million; and by 1960, the number had again multiplied to over 131 million. More significant than this is the fact that the number of persons with surgical insurance has made even bigger strides. In 1960, over 90 percent of the persons with hospital insurance also had surgical insurance coverage. Our total population in 1960 was approximately 180 million, out of which 131 million had coverage. This is a substantial percent of coverage.

These statistics indicate to me that private enterprise, linked with individual responsibility, will—given time and the opportunity—solve whatever problem does remain. This presupposes, of course, that we can prevent Federal intervention in this area of American medicine.

THERE ARE OTHER PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND PLANS THAT OFFER GREATER POTENTIAL FOR SOLVING THE MEDICAL PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND THESE PROGRAMS WILL GIVE MORE ASSISTANCE TO MORE PEOPLE WITH LESS COST

Since medicare is limited to the payment of hospital expenses only, any insurance program designed to provide for other medical expenses and drugs necessarily offers greater protection to the patient. If broad voluntary medical insurance can be purchased, this is by far the best solution to the problem. The Federal, State, and local governments can best meet their responsibilities by initiation of programs which encourage incentive, and even assistance to the patient for the purchase of his own broad medical insurance coverage.

The 1962 University of Michigan Survey of Consumer Finances reports that 57 percent of the persons over 65 had no medical expense in 1961. Of the 43 percent that reported medical expenditures in 1961, nearly all reported expenditures for doctor bills and drugs. Less than half reported expenditures for hospital care. Since our aged incur more doctor and drug bills than hospital bills, any solution we now seek should necessarily consider doctor and drug expenses as well as hospital costs.

The general problem of medical assistance for the aged has occupied the minds and challenged the talents of many individuals and organizations for an extended period of time. As a result, numerous proposals have been advanced, some of them by Members of Congress. One good proposal, the Bow plan, authored by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Representative FRANK T. Bow, proposes to give taxpayers a tax credit for voluntarily providing their own insurance coverage. This is not a tax deduction to reduce the taxable income, but a credit against the assessed tax. This same tax credit can be given to the family, relatives, or employees who provide the insurance protection for their relatives or retired employees. For those persons whose income is low and has no tax liability, the Government will issue a medical care insurance premium certificate, with which the insurance can be purchased.

The advantages of this type program are obvious. It protects against Government interference with the doctor, and individuals will voluntarily provide their own coverage—which will be far better

coverage than medicare. This coverage, when combined with existing State and local programs, should offer adequate coverage for the vast majority of the aged. Children who normally could not assist their aged parents will be encouraged to buy insurance. Another obvious advantage from the cost standpoint is that the cost ceiling will be fixed. Representative Bow proposed the credit figure of \$150. This means that the cost to the Government will be \$150, times the number of aged who qualify, which moneys will not have to be appropriated by the Congress but will represent cost to the Government in the form of reduction in tax revenues.

Compared to the cost of medicare, this is a far more desirable approach. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the medicare cost at \$1.1 billion in the first year, and expects the cost to double in 30 years. Many qualified observers think that this estimate is unrealistically low. Like nearly all other Government programs, the costs exceed the estimates, and the agencies are forced to return to Congress to ask for supplemental appropriations. By that time, there is already so much money tied up in the program that we have no choice but to make the additional money available.

Very recently we have heard that the social security tax will have to be increased to nearly 10 percent just to meet the present obligation of the program. If we add on the additional burden of medicare, we will soon find the tax so burdensome that the entire program will collapse under its own weight, or great financial stress will be placed on the worker and employer just to pay the social security tax.

Even former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare admitted before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in July 1961, that the social security tax was near its maximum. He stated:

I, for one—and I will say this to you publicly—believe that there is a limit to how far you can go in social security taxes. It is my opinion that you are coming to a situation where you cannot have much more by way of taxes in a social security program.

Even the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has admitted that the total disbursements of the old age and survivors trust fund exceeded the total receipts by over \$1 billion. In 1962 money was available to pay benefits because we had a fairly large reserve, but the demands upon the fund are increasing so rapidly that it will soon be depleted unless the revenue is increased by a tax rate increase or an increase in the tax base. The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, very recently introduced a bill—H.R. 6688—to strengthen the actuarial status of the trust funds in the social security program and to increase the tax base upon which the tax is assessed. This will upset the medicare plans because that proposal called for this increase as a means of financing the hospital assistance program, and already we need to utilize the increase for present needs.

14670

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

August 20

SUMMARY

The American people, and particularly the aged, are not completely informed on medicare. The needs of the aged have been overplayed, the value of the medicare plan has been grossly overstated, and the people have not been fully informed of alternative proposals. My purpose in this somewhat extended study has been to lay the facts on the table where all can see them. Readers will draw different conclusions, but the most obvious conclusion supports my original premise that the whole program is politically motivated, designed to get the 17½ million votes involved or it is a deliberate and calculated plan to get the Federal Government in the medical business or it is a combination of the two.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Utah on the obvious research that he has done in preparing the paper he has made for the benefit of the House today in an objective manner. It is important that we do study this problem from the point of view of other than those who usually consider it from one point of view or the other. Certainly the gentleman in the well of the House did not do that and I in commanding him would only ask one additional question to see if his extensive research has shed any light thereon. That is, the relatively sad fact that inflation or deflation of the dollar, depending on which view you want to take, has had on the life savings, the retirement fund or the security that these people have laid up for themselves.

Mr. BURTON. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri I appreciate his comments. Certainly we are all aware of the unsalutary effect that inflation has had on those who have fixed incomes and those who set aside insurance for old age. But we have not any data involved in this study on that.

Mr. HALL. It has always seemed to me that one of the greatest things that we as elected Representatives of the people could do for those who characteristically and by precept and tradition in our Nation have secured their own future, is to quit washing the foundation from beneath them by the relative decline of that on which they have hung their security on the retirement of the old which we hope so much they enjoy.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for his erudite statement and for all of the tables he has inserted, which should be read and reviewed and considered by all of the Members of this body.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN SELF-STYLED "STUDENTS" WHO HAVE BEEN IN CUBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following 58 American self-styled, "students" who have been in Cuba have indicated they expect to return to the United States in the near future: Anatole Ben Anton, Michael David Brown, Charles Nicholas Buchanan, Luria Huberta Castell, John Henry Coatsworth, Wayne Berkeley Combash, Salvatore J. Cucchiari, Robert Wayne Davis, Dorothy Mae Denton, Helen Arlene Driggs, Stephen E. Driggs, Carol Beral Esteves, Elena B. Fleming, and Linda Bonny Fleming.

John Robert Glenn, Elinor Ruth Goldstein, Marcus R. Gordon, Marcia Haag, Barry Hoffman, Clara Dee Jencks, Clinton Michael Jencks, Eric Davis Johnson, Robert Kaffke, Peter John Karman, Ann Gail Kyllingstad, James Lee Lacy, Lee Levi Laub, Jose Maria Lima, Frances Irene Luce, and Phillip Abbott Luce.

Albert Lasater Maher, Stefan Martinot, Mabel Cynthia May, John Milton, Wendie Suzuko Nakashima, Martin A. Nicolaus, Elena Victoria Ortiz, Theodore A. Ostrow, Larry Wilford Phelps, Catherine Jo Prensky, Don Rainman, Christian Lee Raisner, Lillian Redfern, Richard D. Reimann, and Joseph Steven Rex.

John Frederick Salter, Ellen Irene Shallit, Allan Creighton Sheffield, John Ramer Sherrill, Rhoden Hilton Smith, Patricia Ann Sopiak, Christopher Todd Stuart, Roger H. Taus, John Wayne Thomas, Richard Thorne, Mark Tishman, Richard Valez, and Carol Ann Williams.

The 59th American, Hector Warren Hill, died shortly after his arrival in Cuba.

While it is surprising that these 58 are returning from the Cuba they have proclaimed in Castro-sponsored propaganda announcements as an island paradise for democracy, their return in itself will be a violation of the law governing the use of passports. Procedurally, the Department of State will invalidate their passports and turn the files over to the Justice Department for possible prosecution.

The illicit trip to Cuba was an affair well organized and obviously pre-planned by professionals. The Department of State announced on June 26, 1963, that the American students had been offered subsidized travel grants from an agency of the Cuban Government—Federation of University Students in Havana—for travel to Cuba during July of 1963.

This is not to assert that all the students can be so categorized. Rather it is to assert that previous examples of professional subversion and doctrinaire tactics of Cuba made it unlikely that the group is a typical group of American students.

If the students were ignorant of the law prohibiting Cuban travel without the proper visa before leaving, they were

soon enlightened. No less than four times during their trip—at Paris, London, Prague, and Amsterdam—the students were confronted with written statements and oral presentations by Department of State officials. The Department warned them that travel to Cuba by a U.S. citizen without a passport specifically validated by the State Department for that purpose constituted a violation of the travel control law and regulations—title 8 United States Code, section 1185; title 22 Code of Federal Regulations, section 53.3. It was stressed that a willful violation of this law was punishable by a maximum of a \$5,000 fine and/or 5 years imprisonment.

In March, after extensive hearings, the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, released evidence that Cuba serves as an indoctrination and staging area for a wave of Communist sabotage and subversion. The subcommittee—and later the Organization of American States—recommended that all Western Hemisphere countries forbid travel to this hemisphere's beachhead of communism. Also this spring, the Central American heads of state joined with President Kennedy at their meeting in Costa Rica in agreeing to curtail Communist traffic and funds from Cuba to other nations of the hemisphere.

It may prove difficult, however, for the United States to influence other governments to enact bans on Cuban travel if our own restrictions are not adequately enforced. The language of our law is clear, and under this law each student upon his return to the United States can be punished by imprisonment or fines, or both.

These students, in my opinion, should be prosecuted for what they were clearly warned would be a violation of our laws. Failure to prosecute would not only lead to similar trips to Cuba planned by pro-Castro organizations, but our efforts to secure the cooperation of other Latin American countries to fight Communist subversion and infiltration would be greatly hampered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. ASHBROOK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SELDEN, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

14595

economic rights, as the President now requires them to do in certain cases under the directives already issued by him without any authority from Congress. The Government could require people to surrender the right to determine to whom they shall sell or rent their houses, if they participate in the housing program. If a veteran should borrow money under the Veterans Loan Fund Act, the veteran could be required to surrender in advance, as a condition to obtaining the loan, the right to determine to whom he would sell or lease or rent his house. Under the bill, the President would be permitted to use untold billions of dollars of congressional appropriations for the purpose of bribing or coercing parties into surrender of economic rights, of personal rights, of legal rights, and of property rights which have always been dear to the American people.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am associated with two denominational institutions. I am very much interested in possible effects on such denominational institutions.

If the bill were to pass, since the States in most instances exempt the denominational institutions from paying taxes, in the future if they were to do any kind of business with the Federal Government, does the Senator think the Federal Government could tell them how to operate their institutions?

Mr. ERVIN. If they were participating in any federally assisted programs or activities, the Federal Government could even tell them whom they should hire on their faculties. Under the terms of the bill, that could be if the Federal Government thought it necessary to prevent discrimination because of race or color or religion or national origin.

Under the bill, the Federal Government would have the power to go into a religiously affiliated college participating in a federally assisted program and dictate that the college should take on the faculty some person who did not entertain the religion of those who supported that institution, if it concluded such action to be appropriate to prevent discrimination on the ground of creed. The bill would prohibit not only racial discrimination, but also discrimination on account of one's creed.

Title VI is the most expansive blueprint for governmental tyranny which has ever been conceived in the mind of any man on the North American Continent.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I thank the Senator for his answers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina if, under so-called title VI, a great number of innocent persons would be made to suffer from decisions in regard to which they had no power to act whatever?

Mr. ERVIN. There is no question whatsoever about that. For example, under title VI the Federal Government could withhold funds for school aid to schools in an impacted area because the Federal Government wanted the schools to be desegregated. Under the decision

of the Supreme Court in Brown against Board of Education of Topeka, the question of what school a child shall attend is left to the child and his parents. The decision does not belong to the Federal Government. Yet, under the terms of the bill, the Federal Government could usurp the right of the child or its parents to determine that question.

Indeed, it could ignore the desires of the child or its parents, determine how the right of the child or its parents is to be exercised.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it be possible, under title VI, for the Federal Government to hold up funds for programs completely unrelated to education?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Even though the complaint had nothing to do with the failure of a State to put a certain child in a certain school or place?

Mr. ERVIN. There is absolutely no limitation on the power that the bill would vest in the Federal Government in respect to federally assisted programs or activities insofar as racial relations, or religious relations, or questions of national origin are concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it be possible under this program for the Federal Government to hold up funds, let us say, for aid to the aged, the disabled, and dependent children, because there was a practice of social segregation in restaurants in a State?

Mr. ERVIN. No; not to that extent. Title II of the bill would cover such practices in restaurants, but the power given to the Federal Government under title VI applies only to programs or activities which are federally assisted from the financial viewpoint. However, that includes virtually every program or activity in which the Federal Government participates in any way.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator mind giving me an example of how this mechanization could be triggered to cut off funds for the needy, the aged, dependent children, and the blind?

Mr. ERVIN. Under title VI, the Federal Government would have the power to cut off all Federal grants to a State under the Old-Age Assistance Act if it found that some individuals under the program were being discriminated against because of race or religion. Such action would cut off aid for the innocent to punish the allegedly guilty.

No further laws are needed in order to deal with any State or local official for denying any individual any right or privilege in any federally assisted program or activity. Under section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code, which was put on the law books long before the Senator from Louisiana and I were born, a State or local official who wilfully denies to any person, because of race or religion or national origin, or because of any other reason, or lack of reason, any right or privilege such person has under any act of Congress, is subject to prosecution and, upon conviction, can be fined and imprisoned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; and

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

YOUNG DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in last night's Washington Evening Star appeared an article captioned "Democrats Urge Ties With Cuba." I read the article with profound shock, because the article states that at a convention of Young Democrats from 13 Western States at Berkeley, Calif., yesterday, several resolutions were adopted, including these: That the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba; that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw pact nations; that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam; that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished; and that the McCarran Internal Security Act be repealed.

I trust these views are not shared by the leaders of the Democratic Party in Washington. I am sure that all Senators await with a great interest and expectation a clear repudiation of these resolutions by what I am afraid was a most irresponsible meeting of irresponsible young people.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA

BERKELEY, CALIF., August 19.—Young Democrats from 13 Western States ended their convention in Berkeley yesterday with resolutions concerning Cuba, civil rights and American military deployment.

A total of 32 resolutions demanded, among other things, that the United States resume diplomatic relations with Cuba, that the August 28 Negro civil rights parade on Washington be "carried out as planned," that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations and that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.

Other points covered included demands for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act, revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the elimination of compulsory arbitration in strikes and abolition of the death penalty.

The delegates condemned various organizations, the aim of which they said, is to limit the civil rights of nonwhites. These included, the Young Democrats said, the John Birch Society, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Christian Crusade.

HARASSMENT OF SOVIET JEWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a news dispatch from Moscow discloses that the

14596

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 20

Soviet Union has uncovered a new way to harass Jews—the Kremlin now denies Orthodox Jews the right to be buried in consecrated cemeteries. This is a basic right which was never denied Jews even in the darkest periods of the Middle Ages.

This latest Soviet action marks continuation of the Soviet Union's drive against Jews, and it calls for renewed protests by religious organizations and leading citizens throughout the world. At a time when the Soviet Union says it is seeking to relieve the tensions of the cold war, it should be made aware that world public opinion condemns unequivocally a course of action as vicious and unreasoning as this deliberate indignity to a people because of their religion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the news report headline "Jews Denied Cemeteries in Moscow," which appeared in the Washington Post, September 16.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWS DENIED CEMETERIES IN MOSCOW

Moscow, August 15.—A new kind of spiritual setback has developed for the religious Jews of Moscow.

For the first time in memory, Jews who die here are being denied burial in the consecrated ground of a Jewish cemetery. Instead they are buried now in a general civil cemetery, among atheists and non-Jews.

To orthodox Jews, for whom burial in a Jewish cemetery is an ancient religious mandate, new municipal regulations come as a crushing development in deteriorating relations with the Communist regime. Jewish scholars have long regarded consecrated burial as basic, and even the millions of Jews slaughtered during World War II were symbolically reburied in Jewish cemeteries.

All attempts by the Jewish community in Moscow to reverse the new measures have been rejected by Soviet authorities, well-informed sources said Thursday.

The current situation developed when Moscow's 40-year-old Jewish cemetery began filling to capacity, and Soviet officials refused to set aside additional land for a distinctly Jewish burial place.

ECONOMIC FACTORS VITAL ELEMENT IN NEGRO DISCONTENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the recent hearings before the Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, highly significant testimony was presented by Mr. Herman P. Miller, of the Census Bureau, about the deepest sources of Negro discontent. An article in the New York Times of August 18, 1963, describes Mr. Miller's testimony and concludes:

The Negro revolt has many causes, but its basic power is that of the force of economic wretchedness.

The Census Bureau testimony fully supports this thesis and, as the article points out:

Disputes the widespread impression that the relative position of the Negro in the affluent society has improved in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that the Times article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1963]
ECONOMIC FACTORS UNDEALIE NEGRO DISCONTENT—ELIMINATION OF JOBS THROUGH AUTOMATION IS SHARPENING PROBLEM OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONWHITE WORKERS

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The United States is undergoing two internal revolutions. One is the Negro revolt. The other is technological. It is not coincidental that they have arrived together.

The Negro revolt has many causes, but its basic power is that of the force of economic wretchedness. It is this wretchedness that technological change is threatening to exacerbate beyond endurance by automating out of existence many of the unskilled and skilled jobs Negroes hold.

That the Negro community is in the throes of profound economic crisis is evident from the unemployment figures.

Making up less than 10 percent of the country's labor force, Negroes account for 20 percent of its unemployment. Nearly a quarter of those out of work for more than half a year are Negroes.

In July—the most recent month for which comparable figures are available—the jobless rate among white workers was 5.1 percent; among Negroes it was 11.2 percent.

Unemployment of those proportions, were it general, would be a national catastrophe.

The economic vulnerability of Negroes is inherent in their employment pattern. In turn, that pattern is the product of years of discrimination, not only in employment, but also in education, training, and referral to jobs.

POSITION VULNERABLE

For the most part, Negroes hold low-paid jobs. Where they do hold reasonably well paid jobs in industry, they occupy mostly positions that are routine and repetitive and, consequently, lend themselves to being taken over by machines.

Nearly 15 percent of all employed Negroes still work on farms. Only 5 percent of all white workers do. Nearly 15 percent of the employed Negroes work in private households, but only 2 percent of the white workers do.

Only 2 percent of all Negro workers are technicians, while 8 percent of the white workers are in these rapidly-expanding occupations. Only 7 percent of the Negroes are clerks, compared to 16 percent of the whites, and so on.

The evidence is mounting that the situation of Negroes in relation to whites has been steadily deteriorating.

A recent Labor Department study showed that in the years right after World War II the Negro unemployment rate averaged about 60 percent above the white rate. But since 1954 it has been consistently twice as high.

A study by Herman P. Miller of the Census Bureau, issued this month, brought the Negro dilemma sharply into focus.

Mr. Miller disputes the widespread impression that the relative position of the Negro in the affluent society has improved in recent years. In relation to whites, he argues, the Negro's position has not improved for two decades.

MOBILITY HELPFUL

While it is true, Mr. Miller says, that Negroes have raised their occupational levels faster than whites, this has been because they have moved from the rural South to the urban industrial North, not because of any major improvements in job opportunities.

Mr. Miller puts it this way:

"There has been a general upgrading of occupational skills for both whites and Ne-

groes as the American economy has moved away from agriculture and become more complex and industrialized. As a result, Negroes, who were once highly concentrated in sharecropping and farm labor, have now moved up to unskilled and semiskilled factory jobs; some have moved into white-collar employment. But there has been a parallel upgrading of jobs held by whites.

"The real question is whether the relative upward movement has been faster for nonwhites than for whites. In most States the nonwhite male now has about the same occupational distribution relative to whites that he had in 1940 and 1950."

Other measures bear out the point.

The income gap between whites and Negroes narrowed during World War II because of war-induced shortages of unskilled labor, Mr. Miller found. In the last decade, however, there has been no change in income differential between the two groups. The median pay of the Negro worker has remained stuck at about 55 percent of the white.

The disparity is further illustrated.

Negroes who have not gone beyond eighth grade have little chance of becoming anything higher up the occupational ladder than a porter, a laborer, or an assembly line worker.

Negro college graduates at first glance seem to do much better. Three in four were professional or managerial workers—nearly the same proportion as among white college graduates. But the appearance of equality is illusory. The Negroes were concentrated in lower paid jobs.

In terms of income, Mr. Miller found that this boiled down to the fact that the average Negro college graduate could expect to earn less over his lifetime than the white who did not go beyond eighth grade.

The obvious answer to the Negro dilemma is deceptively simple: Open up jobs to Negroes and equip Negroes to fill them.

The first hard fact, however, is that there are not enough jobs to go around. The economy has been producing jobs at a lagging rate. Unemployment has been stuck at well above 5 percent of the work force for more than 5 years and shows no signs of sinking to more tolerable levels soon.

So the Negro's fight is bound inextricably to improving the economy's general performance and this does not seem to be happening very fast.

INCENTIVE LACKING

The educational level of Negroes is still far lower than whites and the gap is not shrinking.

Because of the straited circumstances of their families, many Negro children have to leave school early. This perpetuates the vicious circle.

To attack these problems, Negro leaders are urging enactment of enforceable Federal fair employment practices legislation. Not only should this open up jobs, but it should provide Negro children with the hope necessary to sustain their motivation, the leaders contend.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

There is not much expectation that such legislation will pass Congress this year.

The administration has recommended an increase in Federal aid to vocational education and in the Federal manpower retraining program. But there is grave doubt among many familiar with the problem whether these measures, if enacted, will make much of a dent.

To redeem large masses of unskilled, uneducated workers who have become virtually unemployed and to prevent hundreds of thousands of children from poor families from falling prey to the same ill is going to take far more work and money than the country has grasped, many Negro leaders believe.

Boyd's Board in Blunderland**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Board is in the midst of another blunder. This time the blunder is a multimillion one. This Boyd Board blunder directly involves the livelihood of 2,100 Northeast Airline employees and irrevocably injures the air service presently being enjoyed by the entire Eastern Seaboard.

The Boyd Board decision, a tragic comedy of error in reasoning, is a matter of grave concern to the people of New England. The present availability of air transportation has enhanced the Greater Boston area as one of the foremost educational, cultural, scientific and medical centers of the world. Air transportation by three major carriers has helped to make tourism the third largest industry in Massachusetts and the mainstay of the summer economy of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. All the taxpayers of the United States, along with the traveling public in the Eastern Seaboard, have just cause for alarm over a 3-2 Civil Aeronautics Board decision denying Northeast Airlines all routes south of New York.

With his right hand, Chairman Boyd, together with two other members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has taken away Northeast Airline's only lucrative runs. With his left hand, Boyd has gently patted Northeast Airlines and its 2,100 employees with the false reassurance: "Don't worry, the taxpayers of the United States will now subsidize you as a regional carrier." Chairman Boyd's proposed subsidy represents a cost of at least \$3.7 million of the taxpayers money. This figure, while being Mr. Boyd's estimate, could possibly exceed \$4.5 million, according to the testimony of record in the Board proceeding. The \$3.7-\$4.5 million price tag is only one aspect of the multimillion-dollar loss engendered by the Boyd Board decision. Chairman Boyd failed to note that Northeast Airlines had saved the taxpayers of the United States some \$15 million as a result of their subsidy-free operation of its New England routes during the past 7 years.

The timing of the Civil Aeronautics Board pronouncements is open to serious question. In 1962, the Civil Aeronautics Board approved the acquisition of Northeast Airlines by the Hughes Tool Co. on the basis that it would improve the airline's financial prospects. On July 22, 1963, the Hughes Tool Co. announced that it had put up \$26 million to take care of Northeast's debt. Instead of proceeding to examine the effect of this major refinancing, the Boyd Board issued a press release only 4 days later on July 26, 1963, and announced their intention to deny Northeast of all routes south of New York. To add insult to injury, the Boyd Board delivered its

"final" decision on the Northeast Airlines case at 10 minutes of 10 on Thursday morning, August 15, 1963. At 10 o'clock that same day, the Senate Aviation Committee was scheduled to hold a hearing on airline service to the New England States.

After reading and rereading the Boyd majority opinion, I was shocked and dismayed with the shallow and shortsighted reasoning expressed by the Chairman of this quasijudicial agency entrusted with a congressional mandate to safeguard the public interest. The Washington Post, certainly a neutral in this matter, in an editorial of August 17, 1963, entitled "Airline Amputation," stated:

Issuing what amounts to a death sentence for an airline which has reduced fares and has been holding its own in the vigorous competition for traffic on the Florida route is a step that should not have been taken without a closely reasoned explanation.

Instead of a "closely reasoned explanation," the Boyd majority opinion is a tremendous display of illogic, inconsistency, and absurdity. The minority opinion correctly concludes:

The majority decision does not rest upon any major policy grounds. It does not go beyond holding that Northeast shall not be permitted now, and now only, to furnish services in the Boston-New York-Florida markets. It establishes no guidelines, which the industry has a right to expect, as to the degree of competition which the Board will be prepared to consider seriously tomorrow or in the days thereafter.

In order to arrive at its decision, "Boyd's Board in blunderland" opinion is a classic example of circuitous reasoning which undermines past CAB policy and puts a dark cloud on the future of adequate airline service to the people of New England. The CAB's statutory mandate is to apply the test of public convenience and necessity. The Boyd Board's policy in this case does the direct opposite. Instead of carrying out the policy of giving maximum service to the public and assuring a minimum subsidy wherever possible, the Boyd decision drastically minimizes service to the public and greatly maximizes the need for subsidy.

The policy of the President's Interagency Group on Transportation calls for the preservation of competition where the traffic density can support it. The Boyd majority opinion, in complete disregard of the facts presented at the hearing, promotes monopoly in the air routes on the eastern seaboard. The Boyd decision reverses the longstanding policy of the Civil Aeronautics Board of promoting multiline competition on all major routes. Under this policy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has added a third competitive carrier to the 13 routes in recent years, and I point out that all of them are in smaller markets than this one. The two dissenting members of the Board, relying on the facts presented at the hearing, concluded that a third carrier is required as the need for service has greatly increased since Northeast's Florida operation was first approved by a unanimous board.

Chairman Boyd stated that the public benefits anticipated when temporary certification was granted to Northeast have not materialized. The facts presented at the hearing indicate that the direct opposite conclusion is true. The record shows that there are more nonstop flights in Florida operating now than when Northeast received its temporary certification. The record also shows that more cities are being served along the Florida route. The competition engendered by Northeast Airlines has forced National and Eastern to double their schedules. As a result of this competition, the public has been allowed to fly south at convenient times and at prices it can afford to pay. As the dissenting Board members pointed out, the majority opinion now turns the clock back to 1956 with the same stultifying effects on the market which were present that year. The Boyd decision also results in turning over this recently developed and expanding market to just two carriers as a "captive market." Most important, the Boyd decision may strike the death knell for the demise of Northeast Airlines as an operating carrier.

Mr. Boyd also stated that the decision is based on the ground that future prospects for Northeast Airlines are not financially sound. The financial status of Northeast Airlines is not a unique one. It has been shared at various times by one or both of the carriers that are competing with it on the Florida route. Many of Northeast's financial difficulties were caused by the uncertainties brought about by the Board's temporary certification. In handing down the majority decision, Chairman Boyd has failed to take into proper consideration that crucial fact that major refinancing actions had been taken by the Hughes Tool Co.

The Boyd opinion takes away from Northeast the only route over which it can hope to make any profit. The only sentence of the Boyd decision which smacks of reality is the majority opinion's gross understatement that this action "will inevitably have adverse effects on its (Northeast's) employees, the New England communities in which those employees reside, its creditors and its stockholders." The effect on public air service on the East Coast and on the taxpayers of the United States is a staggering one.

I believe that an investigation of the "Boyd Board's blunder" by the Legislative Oversight Committee is in order unless the Board reconsiders this decision. The Legislative Oversight Committee was specifically set up by Congress to oversee the operations of the so-called independent agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Board and an investigation of the real reasons behind this erratic decision would certainly be in order.

The Boyd Board decision places an additional burden on the taxpayers of New England on the rest of the United States while at the same time reducing the air carrier service they now enjoy. The Boyd Board decision is a disastrous giant step backward on the promotion of a healthy and competitive public service air system for the people of New England.

August 21

Bonneville Invades Southern Idaho**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the 30th of a series of articles on why Bonneville's multimillion-dollar annual losses and areas of substantial and persistent unemployment are not wanted in southern Idaho.

In yesterday's article I pointed out that the flood of letters I am receiving from southern Idahoans expressing their emphatic opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho came from all walks of life. In view of the increasing number of letters coming in, I shall include several letters, editorials or statements in each of my future articles.

The letterhead of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce classes that county as a beautiful, prosperous land, whose friendly people welcome you. Mr. Lovell, president of the board of directors of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce, informs me in his letter of August 6, 1963, that the board of directors have gone on record in opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. It appears that they have no desire to import areas of substantial and persistent unemployment that now plague the Bonneville area into their area of beautiful prosperous land. I am sure they know full well that each additional extension of the socialistic Federal power empire is but the forerunner of more Federal dictation in this and related fields.

Undoubtedly, most of the members of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce are hardheaded businessmen and farmers that know you cannot sell a product for less than it costs without eventually going out of business or having someone else pick up the check. When the Federal Government with its tax-free and less-than-true interest cost operation competes with taxpaying private industry, it does so at an unfair and indefensible advantage. Of course, the tax loss, and the unpaid interest cost are subsidized by the Nations' taxpayers. Mr. Lovell's letter follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Eminett, Idaho, August 6, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the Bonneville Power Administration's inclusion of southern Idaho in its marketing area: We of the Gem County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, have gone on record as opposed to BPA including southern Idaho in its marketing area. Our feeling is that private enterprise is not to be invaded by Government, other than by regulatory laws; that taxpaying private industry can and should furnish this service.

Respectfully,

W. F. LOVELL,
President.

In looking over the pile of editorials, articles and letters expressing opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho, I find another chamber of com-

merce has gone on record on the matter. An article from the Independent Enterprise of Payette, Idaho, on June 6, 1963, reported the unanimous resolution of the Payette Chamber of Commerce voicing its opposition to the Bonneville invasion of southern Idaho. The article follows:

BONNEVILLE OPPOSITION REGISTERED BY CHAMBER

At last week's regular monthly Payette Chamber of Commerce luncheon meeting held at Maude Owens Cafe the group passed a unanimous resolution voicing its opposition to the Government's proposed Bonneville Power project for southern Idaho.

In a prepared resolution to be forwarded to each of Idaho's congressional representatives the chamber urges them to make a more thorough investigation into the project. Following is the resolution in its entirety:

"At the regular monthly meeting of the Payette Chamber of Commerce, held May 29, 1963, the following resolution was unanimously passed.

"The Payette Chamber of Commerce very strongly opposes the order of Secretary Udall proclaiming southern Idaho a part of the Bonneville Power marketing area. The order was issued without congressional consideration based on a feasibility study that was not made public. It is a further trend toward Federal bureaucratic domination of water resources, of irrigation, and of agriculture.

"We sincerely urge that you investigate more thoroughly the project to bring Bonneville power into southern Idaho.

"We are aware that it runs counter to President Kennedy's announced policy of not sponsoring projects which private taxpaying industry is able and willing to undertake. Southern Idaho has ample electric power as shown by past and planned future development. The duplication of expensive transmission lines is anything but good business.

"Bureaucratic dictatorship is not needed and certainly is not wanted.

A. R. MEGORDEN,
"Secretary,
Payette Chamber of Commerce."

Another letter from southern Idaho is Mr. Everett Hustead's letter to me dated July 31, 1963. It is short but to the point. The slogan he quotes indicates that he does not believe Bonneville power would be of any value to southern Idaho or to the seed and grain business with which he is connected. His letter follows:

BUHL, IDAHO,
July 31, 1963.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: Bonneville. Please include us out.

EVERETT HUSTEAD.

Mr. James H. Shields, a member of the Shields firm that has been engaged in the buying and shipping of seeds and grains for over 50 years, expressed his opposition to Bonneville's invasion of southern Idaho in very forceful language. He brands as a lie any inference that the only people in southern Idaho who oppose Bonneville power are those who were interested in the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. Shields through his connection with a firm that has had a part in the growth of southern Idaho over the past 50 years, unquestionably knows and appreciates the beneficial part that the Idaho Power Co. has taken in promoting such growth. Here is Mr. Shields' letter:

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SAYLOR: It is the writer's understanding that our Representative from Idaho, Mr. HARDING, recently made a statement in the House to the effect that the only people in Idaho who did not want Bonneville Power were the people who were interested in the Idaho Power Co. This happens to be a lie.

The writer holds no stock in the Idaho Power Co. and has no ax to grind for them, but he is so completely fed up with bureaucratic dictation and the American brand of socialism that even though the Idaho Power Co. were his enemy, he would still be for them in this case.

We are reasonably heavy users of power and we have no objection whatever to the rates that are charged for this power and service. My suggestion is that you look at the commercial and power rates that are charged to people in this territory before trying to bring in a duplicate facility paid for out of tax money.

Isn't there some way that we can stop this continuous encroachment of socialized bureaucracy on a nation that is already staggering under the load of the entrenched bureaucracy?

Very truly yours,

J. H. SHIELDS.

U.S. Students in Cuba**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am including in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from one of my constituents that raises some very interesting points. In the recent past, the gentlemen from Florida, Congressmen CRAMER and RODGERS and others have raised the question expressing their concern over the effect the U.S. students in Cuba would have on our foreign policy. I submit the contents of this letter in full because I believe it adequately expresses the primary concern many of our citizens have in condoning this type of function.

NOVATO, CALIF.,
July 21, 1963.

Subject: U.S. students in Cuba.
Representative DON CLAUSEN,
House of Representatives, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a teacher and a citizen, I am concerned about the future of our country. I wish I were better informed and really knew what is going on. However, it seems to me that our laissez-faire attitude is about to get us all into something where we shall lose our power to choose individually what is best for ourselves in the future.

The U.S. students who went to Cuba are thinkers who will wield much influence across our Nation when and if they are allowed to return to their campuses. It seems to me that they will be deemed heroes of a cause; in fact, they already are. On the bulletin board at San Francisco State College a couple of weeks ago I saw a dittoed notice put out by the student government that they will support them on

their return, even to taking up a collection to retain legal help to defend their rights to be free to travel anywhere they choose.

These people who are so vocal and aggressive about having freedom and giving freedom do not seem to realize that with rights come responsibilities. All of us cannot be absolutely free to do as we please; for if we are, we take freedom away from others. If we are free, for instance, to have anything we like, we are free to take things that belong to other people. If we are free to speed on the highways, we are free to injure and kill other people.

In giving people freedom to become indoctrinated with the virtues of communism, without exploring the disadvantages, we are taking away the freedom of the free world. The Communists themselves have made no secret of the fact that they plan to rule the whole world; where will individuals have any freedom when and if they take over the world?

When these students went on this trip, did they see and experience any of the hard work which the enslaved people are doing? Did they eat the food the working people eat? Did they sleep and live in the same conditions as the workers do? When I have guests in my home for a short time, we eat better, play more, and work less than usual. Perhaps the best solution to the problem would be to let these students become permanent residents of Cuba, or at least let them stay long enough to see the whole picture. If they wanted to go badly enough to defy the State Department, let them stay long enough to want to come home just as badly as they wanted to go. Then they might give us the right perspective on Cuba.

When these students return to their communities and campuses, they will be spreading the gospel of communism, for as guests they have been shown the glamor of the communistic system. If we as individuals put ourselves out to impress house guests, don't we understand that an enemy government is going to go all out to woo the intellectual group visiting them by showing them the advantages only of their way of living?

This has been an exciting trip for these students. There was little excitement here at home, as these students have grown up in a time when they had no real problems to solve as to the necessities of life or for most of the luxuries, either. They have experienced most of the entertainment that money can buy here. They need new frontiers. They are the pioneers of this generation, and they are pioneering us right out of the way of life that the pioneers lived and fought and died for over the short history of this country.

I hope the people who have the decisions to make will not be soft on these students; for if they are, there are thousands more who will be ready to go next time. They want excitement, too. If these students win this victory, they will win other victories. They will lead their followers back home in doing away with agencies hindering their progress, such as the House Un-American Activities Committee so that they and all their cronies will have complete freedom at our expense.

Really, I am afraid, for I fear for the future of our country and our true freedom. People who have lived under other forms of government and who have become American citizens are really our most devoted citizens; this is proof enough to me that we have the best system.

Will you urge the people in Washington who will deal with these U.S. students when they return from Cuba not to feel sorry for them, but to feel sorry for all the citizens of the United States. Please urge them to do what is best for the future of the United States.

Respectfully yours,
MARGARET BINGELLI

Dallas Reporter Points Out Kennedy Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 21, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as each day passes it is becoming increasingly clear that the Kennedy administration is going to be marked as the most complete failure in national leadership in our history. Our present Chief Executive seems entirely incapable of meeting an issue successfully. His 3 years in office have been a complete contradiction of his campaign promises, and in every area of our national life we are in worsening shape.

Our only hope is that the Nation can survive another year of Kennedy bungling so that the people will have an opportunity to elect an effective leader.

The following article by Robert E. Baskin, head of the Washington bureau of the Dallas Morning News, appeared in the August 18 issue of that newspaper and points out the Kennedy failures to date:

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Aug. 18, 1963]

PERFORMANCE AS PRESIDENT FAILS TO MATCH PROMISES—1960'S GHOSTS HAUNT J.F.K.

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—The ringing words uttered in the heat of the 1960 presidential campaign are coming back hauntingly over and over to the Kennedy administration these August days.

There are those who have kept a record of the words of candidate John F. Kennedy and the accomplishments of President John F. Kennedy. In 1964, Republicans will lay this record before the people as they try to make Kennedy a one-term President.

In politics, there is frequently a cynicism about party platforms and campaign utterances. There has been a tendency to forget them, and both the public and politicians have accepted this circumstance.

But times are changing. A better read public, more careful recording of campaign statements, and more thorough research by party organizations have made the campaign promise, forged by the requirements of the race, a potentially dangerous thing.

President Kennedy has found out this applies particularly in the field of civil rights. Look back to the night of September 9, 1960. The place: Los Angeles.

"I have asked Senator (JOSEPH) CLARK of Pennsylvania, and Congressman (EMANUEL) CELLER, of New York, to prepare a (civil rights) bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January."

This was Candidate Kennedy speaking.

But January came, and there was no great pressure for civil rights legislation. The President needed southern votes in Congress to help get his administration underway.

Then came 1962, and it was a trade bill that carried all the priority. This year, up until late spring, the emphasis was on a vote-getting tax-cut measure, designed to help Democratic fortunes in the 1964 Presidential election.

The Negro community, however, had heard the words uttered at Los Angeles. It had read the sweeping civil rights proposals contained in the 1960 Democratic platform.

Triggered by Birmingham, demonstrations spread across the Nation, North and South. A mammoth march on Washington was scheduled for this month.

Finally, after 2½ years in office, the administration went to Capitol Hill to beg for a tough civil rights bill which it hoped might put out the fire.

The question of whether there is a need for more civil rights legislation is not pertinent. The important point is that great promises have been dealt out in campaigns to woo minority groups, labor, business and other segments of the voting public. In the case of civil rights, the Negro community took Candidate John F. Kennedy at his word and now it demands fulfillment of his promises.

In the sometimes absurd political world of today, facts stated at one time suddenly evaporate overnight.

There was much said in the heat of the 1960 campaign about the state of our defenses.

"The missile lag looms larger and larger ahead," Kennedy stated dolefully on August 26, 1960.

One month after he took office, however, the missile gap vanished and the administration was saying that "any gap favors the United States, not Russia." A veritable miracle appeared to have occurred overnight—after the election of a Democratic President.

But such statements are not as serious to the voting public as the comparison of campaign promises with accomplishments of an administration.

"Our balance of payments will be strong and we can cease to worry about the outflow of gold," Kennedy said in New York on October 12, 1960.

Nearly 3 years later the Treasury Department is desperately seeking methods to correct the balance-of-payments situation and the outflow of gold continues.

In the field of labor relations, the President has found that campaign pledges don't exactly fit the harsh circumstances of a genuine labor dispute.

In the campaign he said: "The next administration must work sympathetically and closely with labor and management. Nor is there a place for the kind of ad hoc last-minute intervention which settled the steel strike."

In office, the President named a number of ad hoc committees to take part in labor disputes. One of these, headed by Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, was thrown into the maritime industry row, and Republicans claimed the industry was threatened with punitive legislation if it didn't give in to the Government wage proposals.

In fiscal affairs, the President found it expedient in the campaign to talk balanced budgets before certain audiences.

At Seattle, Wash., on September 6, 1960, he said: "Let me say that I think it is extremely important that the United States maintains to the extent possible a sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget."

Although there is an escape hatch in the phrase, "to the extent possible," the President has made small effort to keep income and outgo in balance, in a time of national prosperity.

This year the budget is a record \$98.8 billion, with a prospective deficit of 10 billion. Next year, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon confided to the House Ways and Means Committee the other day, a budget will over 100 million is contemplated. If the administration's tax cut is passed, no one knows what the deficit may be.

The great tragedy of the Kennedy administration has been Cuba and the Bay of Pigs defeat, which still goes unexplained officially. Yet in the campaign the President had indicated a strong policy toward Cuba.

"We must attempt," he said on October 20, 1960, "to strengthen the non-Batista democratic anti-Castro forces in exile—thus far these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government."

But when the die was cast in early April 1961 and the Cuban invaders went ashore, somewhere in the depths of the White House a decision was made to deny them American air cover.

Today administration men say that the Castro regime is withering on the vine as a result of American economic policies toward it.

But the Cuban policy that has probably been most dismaying to this country was the administration's failure to get onsite inspections of the presumably dismantled Russian missile bases on the island last fall. Although this had been stipulated as a condition in talks with Khrushchev, it was never achieved. Meanwhile, Russian troops remain in Cuba, and there continue to be reports of military buildups there.

In the area of civil rights, the President has had other conflicts between his campaign statements and his performance.

On October 17, 1960, in Springfield, Ohio, he said: "I am not going to promise a Cabinet post or any other post to any race or ethnic group."

Only last year, however, he tried to get Congress to approve a new urban affairs Cabinet post with the promise that a Negro, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, would head it. Congress said "No."

In a campaign speech in New York, Kennedy had this to say: "There is more power in the presidency than to let things drift and then suddenly call out the troops." But he had to exactly that at Oxford, Miss., last fall.

In the campaign Kennedy was well aware of the criticism leveled at General Eisenhower for playing golf and spending long weekends at Augusta, Ga.

"I am not promising action in the first 100 days alone," he said on November 5, 1960, in New York. "I am promising you 1,000 days of exacting Presidential leadership. I want to be a President who believes in working full time."

The record shows that in his first 2 years in office, the President was away from the White House 215 days—one-third of the time—at such places as Hyannis Port, Palm Beach, Newport, and Glen Ora.

Kennedy was asked in 1960 about nepotism. "Nepotism is dangerous to the public interest and to our national morality," he declared.

In addition to brother Robert F. Kennedy, the Attorney General, Kennedy has appointed brother-in-law Sargent Shriver as head of the Peace Corps. Though not holding an office, brother-in-law Steve Smith occupies a position of high trust, particularly on political matters. Brother EDWAAD (Ted) KENNEDY has been elected Senator from Massachusetts. And the Kennedy sisters are active in a number of semiofficial administration projects.

On specific programs, contained in the Democratic platform, the administration has had a hard time convincing Congress of the need for them.

"Next January," Kennedy said on September 16, 1960, "a Democratic Congress, working with a Democratic administration, will push through a bill providing for adequate—and honorable—medical care for the aged."

The medicare bill remains locked in the House Ways and Means Committee and nothing will be done on it this year—3 years after Kennedy set a schedule for its passage.

Even the press has grounds to quarrel a bit with the President's campaign promises.

"I would think that whoever was President would see the press at least once a week," Kennedy said in Independence, Mo., on October 20, 1960.

The record: 46 press conferences in the first 2 years of office and even fewer this year.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 18, 1963]

AN EFFECTIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL CAN REMOVE HOFFA FROM OFFICE

WASHINGTON.—On October 17, 1960, John F. Kennedy made a statement he may well rue today.

"An effective Attorney General," he declared, "with the present laws on the books, can remove Mr. Hoffa from office."

Robert F. Kennedy has served 2½ years as his brother's Attorney General.

James R. Hoffa, now as in 1960, is still firmly in the driver's seat as president of the Teamsters Union.

believe it is not, in its present form good for our national welfare and security."

Orcutt, Calif.: "Russia never keeps a treaty (unless it is to her benefit to do so). What she has up her sleeve now, no one can guess * * * but we don't trust our own investigators to keep a close enough eye on her, and we don't trust our leadership to take the proper action if we did find out she was violating the agreement."

Pasadena, Calif.: "I protest the test ban deal with the Russians. Why give them any further power than us?"

South Gate, Calif.: "D. Manuilsky stated 30 years ago that the Communists would make unheard of peace overtures, then when we capitalists were lulled into complacency they would smash us—they tell us what they will do, why can't we believe them after repeated proofs?"

Bradenton, Fla.: "It is indeed a sad day for our country."

Cypress, Calif.: "I do not sleep good nights for fear of the things that are going on in Washington."

Compton, Calif.: "It is an integral part of Communist strategy for its opposition to disarm."

Los Angeles, Calif.: "Protest the signing of the test ban treaty with Russia. How can we trust them now?"

Menlo Park, Calif.: "With Cuba a Soviet stronghold—with millions of people still unwilling captives of Soviet Russia, this is no time to call a halt to testing—or proceed in any way to disarm America."

Pittsburgh, Pa.: "Vote against the test ban treaty."

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECOG, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECOG, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

ter; or that the Port Authority would sponsor the World Trade Center to the south. This is one of many examples of Noyes' real estate sense or possibly his intuition.

Again, in 1928 this so-called New York Hospital property would have been the greatest tribute of all to Noyes' record in the real estate field. But for the great panic of 1929 Noyes and Schulte with John J. Raskob as their partner would have proceeded with the most spectacular building of all time on their land. On October 6, 1929, just 23 days before the stock market's disastrous plunge, the New York Herald Tribune devoted the entire front page of its Sunday section to the announcement of a project which staggered the imagination—a 150-story superskyscraper which would dwarf the Empire State Building then in the planning stages. "There is no question in my mind," says Noyes, "that this building would have been erected if we had not come into the panic of 1929-30."

Incidentally, Raskob did figure in Noyes' business life other than in the potential deal for the 150-story building on plot of 150,000 square feet because it was Noyes, as broker, who with Raskob of General Motors worked out for Max N. Natanson, as principal, all the ramifications of the deal in connection with the present General Motors Building, including the obtaining of the leasehold covering the ground owned by the Wertheim estate and the negotiation of the terms of the General Motors lease, the financing and the complete rental and management of the building until it was sold to Louis Glickman.

As early as 1915 Noyes forecast the trend north to Fulton Street of the insurance district, then on William Street south to Wall Street including buildings on Pine Street to Maiden Lane. In 1935 he likewise foresaw the advantages of the Avenue of the Americas (then Sixth Avenue) would be recognized by investment builders. Noyes himself purchased three adjacent 20-foot residences on 51st Street between Fifth and Sixth Avenues, two in 1935 for \$78,000 and the other in 1940 for \$35,000. During the last 5 years there has been a spectacular wave of construction on that avenue and the Noyes properties cost the developers of a large office building \$1 million to acquire for demolition plus an additional \$1.5 million to acquire a tenant's lease.

Noyes has always considered well-located property in New York City "the best of all investments." He further feels that any boy with average intelligence, strict integrity and high ideals, and willing to work hard has a chance to achieve success in the real estate profession.

By the middle 1920's Charles F. Noyes Co., Inc., was closing about 7,000 sales or leases a year as broker or agent, involving a gross of more than \$300 million. This included the operations of Noyes National, active in the South, Midwest and west coast. About 1930 this business was transferred to New York City, where it was reported that the company managed about 300 office, loft and commercial buildings, and its 3,000 clerical and building service employees collected some \$40 million in rents annually from 5,500 tenants.

During the boom days of 1926, the United Cigar Stores Co., Inc., bought a half-interest in the Noyes company for \$1.2 million and insured Noyes' life for \$2.4 million—at that time one of the largest insurance policies ever issued on an individual's life. When United Cigar had financial difficulties Noyes personally bought back the half interest.

Early in Noyes' business career he showed his positive ideas against discrimination and on July 1, 1947, he personally organized the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation, Inc. For the fiscal year 1948 the amount distributed by the foundation was \$54,528. By 1961 the figure had increased \$398,970. During the period that the foundation has been in

operation, 3,787 students have been helped to become better citizens.

Among many honors bestowed on Noyes he particularly cherishes the J. P. Morgan Medal of the New England Society in 1962 for having established student loan funds in several New England colleges and universities; the Horatio Alger Award bestowed in 1959; and the title "Honorary Citizen of Texas," awarded him by Gov. Price Daniel in 1958. In 1953 Noyes was made an honorary doctor of laws at St. Lawrence University in Canton, N.Y., and received a similar degree in 1955 from Park College in Parkville, Mo. The following year Pace College honored the veteran broker with the degree of Doctor of Commercial Sciences.

Besides being a member of 34 different real estate and civic organizations, Noyes has over the years been a director of the American Red Cross; president and trustee of the Heckscher Trust; trustee and at times member of the executive committee of the Title Guaranty & Trust Co.; for nearly 30 years, a member of the advisory board of directors of the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.; and for 65 years a director of the Norwich (Conn.) Daily Bulletin, the sixth oldest newspaper in the country, established in 1790. Incidentally, Noyes' father, Charles D. Noyes, was president of the Bulletin Co., a position now filled by Harrison C. Noyes, a brother.

State "a humiliated puppet of the Kennedys." He also told the President that had he known that Bobby would have been named Attorney General he would have opposed him, rather than managed his campaign in 1960.

Morgan, a former district attorney general, has been a top leader in the Democratic party for more than 40 years.

Full text of Morgan's letter, copies of which were sent to Vice President Lyndon Johnson, Senators Kefauver and Gore and Representative Brock, follows:

"MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a lifelong Democrat. In 1938 I managed the campaign in this county for Franklin D. Roosevelt and in that campaign the first integrated meeting was held in our auditorium and the principal speaker was a Negro Congressman.

"In 1960 I managed your campaign in this county and a rally was held at the same place in your behalf and at that meeting it was my pleasure to introduce Senator Lyndon Johnson and Lady Bird Johnson.

"Managing your campaign was not a popular assignment. Many people were skeptical of you because of your religion. I am a Baptist, but I have no religious prejudice, nor do I possess any racial prejudice.

"Your every act from the date of your inauguration has justified my belief that your religion would not dictate your judgment as President of the United States.

"But, had I known then that it was your intention to appoint your brother Robert Kennedy as Attorney General and that you and he together would try to usurp the freedom of the people and supplant our free government with a dictatorship and a police state, I would have done what I shall do when you run again—oppose you.

"There is no way to justify the spending of \$15 million to keep one person in one particular college, when there are thousands of worthy boys and girls, both white and black, that are denied a chance to attend any college because they have no funds.

"Nor do I sanction your course in taxing to death the people of this Nation to give foreign aid to countries who don't even levy a tax on their own people.

"In my judgment the course you and your brother are taking is a menace to this country and could easily lead to a dictatorship and a police state, and that this Nation can no longer say the Land of the Free, but can still say the Home of the Brave.

"You are destroying the trust that the people of this Nation have always had and should have for its Chief Executive and you are striving to place in the hands of Robert Kennedy more power than any man should ever seek or have. The image the people have of Robert Kennedy is that he is a small bigot and that he is a menace to the liberties of this Nation.

"The power that you and he are seeking under the mask of civil rights is but a means to attain the power to suppress the will of all who oppose you and to make the chief executive of every State of this Union a humiliated puppet of the Kennedys.

"Why doesn't your heart bleed for the North American Indians who are citizens of the United States and whose rights are trampled under foot in every State of this Union, where they live?

"You spend more than \$15 million of the people's money to keep a man in school, because you say his constitutional rights were denied—I fail to see where you have spent 16 cents to secure the Indian in his equal rights. I'll answer that question for you—political expediency.

"You are riding a high horse, roughshod, but I warn you that you are fomenting a revolution, and if it comes, you, your high horse and little brother Bobbie will know just how great is the might of the wrath of the people of this Nation.

"Yours very truly,
FLETCHER R. MORGAN."

A5300

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 20

U.S. Relations With Yugoslavia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT**

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a very fine article on our relations with Yugoslavia recently appeared in the Arkansas Gazette. It was written by Mr. Perrin Jones, who is the publisher of the Searcy, Ark., Daily Citizen. Mr. Jones is one of the outstanding young newspapermen of my State and, I believe, has done an exceptional job of defining the complex issues involved in our relations with Yugoslavia. I ask unanimous consent that his article entitled "Arkansas Publisher Looks at Yugoslavia," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARKANSAS PUBLISHER LOOKS AT YUGOSLAVIA

(Editor's Note.—This article is reprinted from the Searcy, Ark., Daily Citizen, whose publisher, Perrin Jones, has been writing a series of articles on his observations while traveling in Central and Eastern Europe.)

(By Perrin Jones)

America has given the Tito government of Yugoslavia a total of \$2 billion in foreign aid since the Tito break with Stalin in the late forties. At present, in addition, Yugoslavia owes the United States about \$100 million in loans and repayment of seized American property. Yugoslavia is repaying this debt on schedule.

But Yugoslavia, no matter what may be said for her people, her system, or her prosperity, is still a country which embraces communism. In this fact lies a basic problem for the United States that is already a hot potato and one which will get progressively hotter in the future. Can the greatest democratic power on earth afford to give massive aid to a Communist government in order to help it build prosperity? Or to put it another way, are we helping to promote communism by bolstering the Government of Yugoslavia? This question bothers a lot of Americans. I must admit it bothered me before I went to Yugoslavia and actually got the feel of the conditions and saw what our American aid has done.

Some will say that I was brainwashed on this subject, but not being at all naive, I prefer to think that for once, I see what our country is trying to do in Yugoslavia and I approve of it.

The basic theory behind American aid to the independent communism of Tito is that the money we spend there is helping Tito to remain independent of the Kremlin, that it is fostering a difference of opinion within the monolithic structure of world communism. One thing that radically disturbs the quiet and peaceful movement of communism in its efforts to engulf the world is when a difference of opinion arises. This little thing—this difference—that would go unnoticed in the West brings the gears of world communism crashing into each other with a force that an American cannot understand. In short, we've paid \$2 billion to keep Tito from having to go to Moscow with his hat in his hand. It is a stiff price, but I think I can show that it was worth it.

Before Tito broke with Stalin, Russian troops actually had naval bases on the Adriatic and the front line of Communist expansion was just across this little body of

water from Italy. Stalin had the warm water ports in Europe that not even the grandest of the Russian czars ever hope to gain. Subversives could infiltrate Italy *** already with a strong Communist front. Greece was in constant turmoil with Red agitators drifting through Yugoslavia and a civil war there actually occurred. Tito was a heroic figure in Europe from his resistance to the Germans and the Russians got full mileage out of this.

Then Stalin cracked down to consolidate his empire and Tito stood up and said "no." This was the first chink in the wall and we rushed in with immediate and extensive support. Now, more than a decade later, Yugoslavia is still independent and extremely prosperous.

We Americans talk a lot about the "self-determination" of peoples. Even, we explain this to mean that we don't really care what sort of government a nation has so long as it is freely arrived at and so long as personal freedom is promoted. If these are really our criteria—if we believe in this—then we have no right as a Nation to penalize Yugoslavia just because she travels under the "Communist" banner. Our own State Department admits that Yugoslavia is the only nation in the Eastern bloc that has no agents butting into our affairs or the affairs of her neighbors, she is definitely not a part of the world movement of Communist subversion.

American aid to Yugoslavia is over. The plan has expired and the Yugoslavs are not asking for additional aid. But, in order that the Yugoslavs have enough hard currency to pay us the \$100 million owed to us, she must continue her favored position in trade with the United States. Yugoslavia and Poland, the two "Independent Communist" nations were given "most favored nations" treatment by the United States several years ago but there is now a move afoot in Congress to remove this distinction this year and, if it is done, the Yugoslavs will have no way to continue competitive trade with the United States, there will be no way to pay off the U.S. debt. The country will immediately have to begin an austerity program and eventually, if she is not strong enough to go it alone, she will be forced to go back to Moscow. This, to me, is unthinkable.

Democrats Urge Ties With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. DELBERT L. LATTA**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note the positions taken on various national issues by the Young Democrats from 13 Western States at their recently concluded convention in Berkeley, Calif. The Evening Star of August 19, 1963, reported on some of the resolutions adopted at this convention and I believe the Members and the Nation should be familiar with the positions taken on these matters by this group of Democrats.

The article follows:

DEMOCRATS URGE TIES WITH CUBA

BERKELEY, CALIF., August 19.—Young Democrats from 13 Western States ended their convention in Berkeley yesterday with resolutions concerning Cuba, civil rights, and American military deployment.

A total of 32 resolutions demanded, among other things, that the United States resume

diplomatic relations with Cuba, that the August 28 Negro civil rights parade on Washington be "carried out as planned," that a nonaggression pact be signed between NATO and Communist Warsaw Pact nations and that the United States withdraw its troops from South Vietnam.

Other points covered included demands for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act, revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, the elimination of compulsory arbitration in strikes, and abolition of the death penalty.

The delegates condemned various organizations, the aim of which they said, is to limit the civil rights of nonwhites. These included, the Young Democrats said, the John Birch Society, the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Christian Crusade.

Michel Blasts REA Loan to Ski Resort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 20, 1963

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, has been waging a vigorous battle to bring some sense of responsibility on the part of Departments and Bureaus to see that moneys appropriated are spent in a proper manner.

Once again he has brought to the attention of the House the irresponsible manner in which the REA continues to make foolish loans at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Under unanimous consent I wish to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Chicago Daily Tribune on August 17, 1963, concerning this subject:

MICHEL BLASTS REA LOAN TO SKI RESORT
(By Philip Warden)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—Representative ROBERT MICHEL, Republican, Illinois, accused Rural Electrification Administration officers of acting like juvenile delinquents today by continuing to lend money to ski resorts over objections of Congress.

MICHEL, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, charged the REA with having "defied the intent of Congress" in announcing a \$110,000 loan yesterday to a Pennsylvania ski resort.

MICHEL said the loan to the Blue Knob Development Corp. of Altoona, Pa., by the Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Huntingdon, Pa., will be used to purchase snowmaking equipment and a ski lift.

CITES EARLIER LOAN

Congress went on record against such loans last year, MICHEL said, when a similar loan was made to a northern Illinois ski resort by an REA cooperative.

"It is a sad commentary on the present state of bureaucratic thinking when an agency established by the Congress, such as REA, thinks it can blantly disregard parental instruction and guidance," MICHEL said.

"REA is acting like a juvenile delinquent, and, therefore, deserves to be treated like one. Congress, as a concerned parent, may be compelled to apply stern disciplinary measures on this wayward agency."